UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/760,404	01/12/2001	William T. Daniell	10004554-1	1751

7590   04/21/2005

HEWLETT-PACKARD COMPANY
Intellectual Property Administration
P.O. Box 272400
Fort Collins, CO   80527-2400

EXAMINER
ZIA, SYED

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2131	

DATE MAILED: 04/21/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

		Application No.	Applicant(s)
Office Action Summary		09/760,404	DANIELL ET AL.
		Examiner	Art Unit
		Syed Zia	2131

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE <u>3</u> MONTH(S) FROM
THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed
  after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
  Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any
  earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>11/22/2005</u>.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**.   2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is
   closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-22* is/are pending in the application.

   4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-22* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

   Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

   Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

   a)☐ All   b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

   1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

   2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

   3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage
      application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

   * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1)☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2)☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3)☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
   Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

4)☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
   Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.

5)☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)

6)☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Amendment

This office action is in response to request of reconsideration and argument filed on
November 15, 2004. Applicant currently amended claims 1-3, 5, and 8-14. Applicant added new
claims 15-22. The amendment filed have been entered and made of record. Presently pending
claims are 1-22.

Therefore, presently Claims 1-22 are pending for further consideration.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed on November 15, 2004 have been fully considered but they
are not persuasive because of the following reasons:

Regarding Claims 1-22 applicants argued that the cited prior art (CPA) [Hayes
(U. S. Patent 6,339,826)] does not teach, "a context switch is performed in response to a
detection of an operational problem or that any request for changing from one sate of alleged
security profile to another is provided in response to an operational problem".

This is not found persuasive. Cited prior art clearly teaches system and method for a list of
applications to which the user has access permission, and objects corresponding to each
application in the list are downloaded. The objects when selected by the user, a request for

downloading corresponding application to the user station are outputted to server. Log-on

request including user identifier is received at the server from a user station. The server uses the

users log-on identifier to build a list of applications for which the user has access permission.

Therefore, the system of prior art provides common repository for configuration information for

users and applets in client-server environment. Allows user to login from any computer in the

system at any time and have it configured automatically at run time according to *preferences*

stored for the user at the server. Prevents user from winding up with applications configured on

desktop to which user does not have access by *testing each application access preference* set by

user against the application permission present on server.

As a result, the system of cited prior art provides a system and method for automatically

implementing a security profile that has been previously implemented within the computer

system.

Applicants clearly have failed to explicitly identify specific claim limitations, which

would define a patentable distinction over prior arts.

The examiner is not trying to teach the invention but is merely trying to interpret the claim

language in its broadest and reasonable meaning. The examiner will not interpret to read

narrowly the claim language to read exactly from the specification, but will interpret the claim

language in the broadest reasonable interpretation in view of the specification. Therefore, the

examiner asserts that cited prior art does teach or suggest the subject matter broadly recited in

independent and dependent claims. Accordingly, rejections for Claims 1-22 are respectfully

maintained.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the

basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

Claims 1-22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Hayes et al, hereinafter

Hayes (USP 6,339,826).

As per claims 1, 8, and 9, Hayes teaches: memory (Fig 2, element 212), and a security

application configured to lock down resources of said computer system (col. 19, lines 50-55) by

modifying a machine state of said computer system in response to a request for activating an

original state of a security profile for a user, said security application configured to store data

indicative of said machine state in said memory (col. 17, lines 60-64), said security application

configured to modify said machine state (col. 20, lines 1-5) in response to a request for activating

a new state of said security profile *for said user* (col. 12, lines 34-46, col.7 lines 62-63), said

security application configured to retrieve said data in response to a request for recovering said

original state of said security profile and to modify said machine state based on said retrieved

data thereby activating said original state of said security profile for said user (col. 7, lines 67

col. 8, lines 5).

As per claim 22, Hayes teaches memory (Fig 2, element 212), and a security application

configured to define a security profile for controlling access to at least one resource of said

computer system (col. 19, lines 50-55), said security application configured to activate an

original state of said security profile and to store data indicative of said original state in said

memory(col. 17, lines 60-64), said security application further configured to activate a new state

of said security profile (col. 7, lines 62-64), col.20 lines 1-5) in response to a user request(col.

12, lines 34-46), said security application further configured to enable a user to undo an error in

defining said new state by allowing said user to initiate activation of said original state based on

said data (col. 7, lines 67 col. 8, lines 5, col.19 line 16 to line 26).

As per claims 2 and 10, Hayes teaches said security application includes default data defining

default levels of security (col. 7, line 16), wherein said security application enables a user to

select one of said default levels of security (col. 7, lines 16-19), and wherein said security

application is configured to modify said machine state in response to said request for activating

said original state of said security profile based on said selected default level of security (col. 17,

lines 60-64).

As per claims 3 and 11, Hayes teaches said security application defines a plurality of rules for

locking down said computer system (col. 7, Lines 17-18), wherein said security application

configured to enable ones of said rules based on which of said default levels is selected by said

user (col. 7, lines 54-55), and wherein said security application is further configured to cause said

computer system to enforce each enabled rule within said plurality of rules by modifying said

machine state in response to said request for activating said original state of said security profile

(col. 19, lines 50-55).

As per claims 4 and 12, Hayes teaches said security application enables said user to change

which of said rules are enabled (col. 7, lines 16-17).

As per claims 5 and 13, Hayes teaches memory (Fig 2, element 212), and a security application

defining a plurality of said rules (col. 7, lines 18-19), said security application configured to

enable a user to select a set of said rules to define an original state of a security profile for a user

(col. 7, lines 17), said security application configured to lock down said computer system by

causing said computer system to enforce said selected set of rules in response to an activation

request (col. 19,lines 50-55), said security application further configured to store data indicative

of said original state of said security profile (col. 17, lines 60-64), said security application

configured to change said security profile for said user from said original state to a new state by

changing which of said plurality of rules are enforced by said computer system based on inputs

to said computer system (col. 12, Lines 33-40), said security application configured to retrieve

said data in response to a user request and to automatically identify said set of rules based on said

retrieved data (col. 17, Lines 65-66), said security application further configured to return said

security profile for said user to said original state thereby causing said computer system to

enforce said identified rules in response to said user request (col. 19, line 53).

As per claims 6 and 14, Hayes teaches said security application is further configured to define

multiple sets of default data (col. 7, Lines 15-16), each of said sets of default data identifying

different ones of said rules as being enabled for enforcement (col. 7, Lines 17-18), said security

application configured to enable said user to select one of said sets of default data and to

determine which of said rules are selected for inclusion into said selected set of rules based on

which of said rules are indicated as enabled (col. 7, Lines 54-65).

As per claim 7, Hayes teaches said security application enables said user to change which of said

rules are indicated as being enabled (col. 7, lines 16-17).

As per claim 15, Hayes teaches said original state grants access to a particular resource of said

computer system based on a user identifier, and wherein said new state denies

access to said particular resource based on said user identifier (col.20 line 36 to line 45).

As per claim 16, Hayes teaches an operating system configured to read said machine state

modified by said security application and to control access to at least one resource of said

computer system based on said machine state (col.20 line 55 to line 61).

As per claim 17, Hayes teaches said machine state read by said operating system comprises a

flag indicative of whether access to said at least one resource is restricted (col.14 line 54 to col.

15line 5).

As per claim 18, Hayes teaches said operating system is configured to analyze, in response to

said flag, data indicating which users are authorized to access said at least

one resource (col.14 line 50 to col.15 line 5).

As per claim 19, Hayes teaches said security application, by activating said original state in

response to said request for recovering said original state, enables said user to undo an error in

defining said new state of said security profile for said user (col.19 line 16 to line 26).

As per claim 20, Hayes teaches detecting an operational problem caused by activation of said

new state of said security profile; and providing said request for recovering said original state of

said security profile in response to said detecting (col.19 line 16 to line 26, and col.9 line 30 to

line 41).

As per claim 21, Hayes teaches said storing is in response to said request for activating said

original state of said security profile (col.9 line 13 to line 15 and col. 9 line 30 to line 41).

Conclusion

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this

Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a).

Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE

MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO

MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after

the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period

will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37

CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event,

however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this

final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the

examiner should be directed to Syed Zia whose telephone number is 571-272-3798. The

examiner can normally be reached on 9:00 to 5:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's

supervisor, Ayaz Sheikh can be reached on 571-272-3795. The fax phone number for the

organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent

Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications

may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished

applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR

system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR

system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

sz
April 08, 2005

AYAZ SHEIKH
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100